

App. No. 10/634,384  
Office Action Dated January 11, 2006

### **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. The Specification and claim 12 are hereby amended. Claims 1-11 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Amendment of claim 12 is supported by Figure 6.

The title is objected to for not being descriptive. The title is amended to address the concerns of the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration of the title is requested.

Claims 12-20 were rejected as being anticipated by Yap (US 6,307,528). Applicant traverses this rejection. Yap does not disclose an organic EL display device including a light emitting element that covers both the first and second electrode segments, the light emitting element having one light emitting surface directed away from the first and second electrode segments, as required by claim 12. Rather, Yap teaches an organic material layer (60, rejection equates to the claimed light emitting element) that is sandwiched between a lower electrode (54) and an upper electrode (62). See Figure 3a. In contrast, claim 12 provides a clear display by requiring an organic EL display device in which light generated by a light emitting element is emitted directly, without passing through either of the electrode segments. Favorable reconsideration of claims 12-20 is requested.

App. No. 10/634,384  
Office Action Dated January 11, 2006

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612)455-3804.

Respectfully Submitted,



Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No.: 30,300  
Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.  
225 South Sixth Street  
Suite 2650  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
612.455.3800

Dated: May 11, 2006



DPM:mfc